

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
April 23, 2014

Call to Order: Chairman Smith called the meeting to order in the Roselle Village Hall Council Chamber at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call:

Present: Commissioners Beth Keller-Stein, Hiren Patel, Bob Stare, Bruce Berkshire, and Chairman Brian Smith

Absent: Commissioners Tom Stringfellow and Paul Zinni

Staff: Pat Watkins (Community Development Director)
Bob Zimmerer (Planner)

Approval of the Agenda: Commissioner Keller-Stein moved to approve the agenda for the meeting as presented. Commissioner Stare seconded the motion and the motion carried (5-0) by a voice vote.

Approval of Minutes: Commissioner Keller-Stein moved to approve the minutes for the meeting of February 19, 2014 as presented. Commissioner Patel seconded the motion and the motion carried (5-0) by a voice vote.

Consideration of Petitions:

A. PZ 14-1016 – Promenade Pointe – Amended PUD w/ Special Use & Variations

Chairman Smith asked for a motion to open the public hearing for PZ 14-1016. Such a motion was made by Commissioner Berkshire and seconded by Commissioner Stare. The motion carried (5-0) by a voice vote.

Planner Zimmerer provided an overview of the petition, as laid out in his staff report. In short, the developer/petitioner would like the change the approved plan for Promenade Pointe (the development with Itasca Bank as its primary tenant) in order to build a smaller building addition in the second phase (the part east of Bokelman Street not yet constructed) and to add a second drive-through facility. (There is already a drive-through facility for the bank.)

Planner Zimmerer then introduced the petitioner.

The petitioner, Perry Janke of Village Crossing LLC at 57 E. Hattendorf Avenue (Suite 120) in Roselle, did not add much to Staff's overview, as he stated that Staff provided a good overview. However, Mr. Janke did indicate that he was ready to answer any questions.

Chairman Smith then opened the discussion to members of the Commission.

Subsequently, the vast majority of the Commission's discussion centered on understanding the layout, as well as thought process behind the design of, the second drive-through facility, the ramp to the parking garage on the basement/lower level, and the six parking spaces adjacent to and near the drive-through facility and ramp. The highlights of this discussion were as follows:

- Can the ramp be relocated?
 - The length of the ramp as proposed is as short as possible, as it is as steep as practical. Thus, the ramp cannot be shortened.
 - The placement of the ramp as proposed aligns with the drive-aisle in the center of the parking garage; thus, a relocation of the ramp would result in a "goofy" drive-aisle path in the garage (in order to align with the ramp) and less parking spaces in the garage (to make way for the "goofy" drive-aisle path).
- Can the drive-through layout/path be reversed to a more standard (i.e. counter-clockwise) configuration?
 - The flow of vehicles in the rear/south of the existing part of the development is to the east (i.e. toward the area of the drive-through); thus, there needs to be a path for those vehicles to leave the development. At present, those vehicles travel north through the drive-aisle through the building (i.e. the tunnel) to the only full-access driveway for the development at Irving Park Road and Bokelman Street.
 - As proposed, those vehicles can still use the same path or travel along the new drive-aisle near the southeast and east property lines to the egress-only (and right-only) driveway onto Irving Park Road at the far northeast portion of the development.
 - If the drive-through layout/path were reversed, then the drive-aisle through the building (i.e. the tunnel) would have to be reversed (southbound) forcing those vehicles in the rear/south to exit via the drive-through and into a partial-access, as opposed to full-access, driveway. Alternately, those vehicles could circle back westward around the entire development. Therefore, while reversing the drive-through layout/path would make the configuration of the drive-through better it would come at the expense of the configuration of the rest of the development.

- Are the six parking spaces adjacent to and near the drive-through facility and ramp needed since the development provides more parking spaces than necessary?
 - The flow of pedestrians through the development is along the wide sidewalk in front of the building; however, the pedestrian flow transitions back to the carriage walk along Irving Park Road near the five parking spaces.
 - The petitioner agreed with Staff's recommendation (in the staff report) to remove the easternmost of these six spaces in order to allow room/space to have the two-way drive-aisle to the drive-through and the ramp align better with the one-way driveway exiting onto Irving Park Road.
 - Regarding the other five spaces, the desired tenant for this part of the development is some type of eatery or restaurant. Thus, depending upon the type of eatery or restaurant, more parking may be necessary or less parking may be necessary. For example, an eatery or restaurant with a lot of carry-out business would likely want the extra spaces while another type of eatery or restaurant with less carry-out business (other than the drive-through) may want to use the area for outdoor dining/seating.

In addition, Commissioners asked some specific questions.

Commissioner Keller-Stein asked about the contents of the eastern/side yard (e.g. landscaping, setback, etc.) and the petitioner obliged.

Commissioner Stare asked why the petitioner was seeking the amendments, and Mr. Janke responded that the market for retail and office space has been, and continues to be, weak.

Chairman Smith asked about the status of the parkway improvements adjacent to the development, and the petitioner answered that it all should be done later this spring.

Chairman Smith then opened the floor to any comments or questions concerning this petition.

Nick Alfano, of 57 E. Hattendorf Avenue (Apt. 302) in Roselle, asked whether a specific tenant was "lined up." The petitioner answered "no."

Chairman Smith then asked for the Commissioners' sentiments. All the Commissioners expressed their support for the petition but agreed to impose three conditions as follows:

1. Remove one parking space (#18) to allow the two-way drive-aisle to the drive-through and the ramp align better with the one-way driveway exiting onto Irving Park Road.

2. Five parking spaces (13 – 17) are not required, as the developer/petitioner shall have the option not to construct them and instead use the same area for outdoor seating.
3. Employees of businesses (other than Itasca Bank), as well as residents of the four dwelling units, shall park in the garage on the basement/lower level.

Chairman Smith then asked whether there were any final comments or questions concerning this petition. There were none.

Chairman Smith then asked for a motion to close the public hearing for PZ 14-1016. Such a motion was made by Commissioner Berkshire and seconded by Commissioner Patel. The motion carried (5-0) by a voice vote.

Chairman Smith then asked for a motion to find the findings of fact in favor of the petitioner subject to the conditions just discussed. Such a motion was made by Commissioner Stare and seconded by Commissioner Berkshire. The motion carried (5-0).

Chairman Smith then asked for a motion to recommend approval of the petition subject to the conditions set forth in the findings. Such a motion was made by Commissioner Patel and seconded by Commissioner Stare. The motion carried (5-0).

Old Business: There was none.

New Business: Director Watkins provided the Commission with a brief update concerning projects within the Village of Roselle.

Adjournment: Chairman Smith then called for a motion to adjourn, and the meeting concluded around 8:25pm.